



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,296	07/14/2003	Wing Lee	IDF 2398 4000-12500	6314
28003	7590	06/20/2006	EXAMINER	
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			WINTER, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

STATUS

Claims 1-35 have been examined .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suarez. (US Patent 5,790,789)

As per claim 1

Suarez ('789) discloses a system for making computing applications throughout an enterprise aware of business events comprising:

an enterprise integration layer that automatically publishes business events comprising: (Figure 11)

set of client access interfaces coupled to front-office applications wherein the interfaces transform data from the format of the front-office applications to a common data format;(Column 9, lines 14-39)

a set of adapters coupled to the business object server wherein the adapters transform business objects created by the business object server into data requests compatible with a back-office system; (Column 11, lines 15-43)

an enterprise object model to standardize business objects;(Figure 1)

a messaging system coupled to the enterprise integration layer that automatically subscribes to business events published by the enterprise integration layer and automatically makes the computing applications aware of the business events. (Column 12 lines 37-64)

a business object server coupled to the client access interfaces wherein the business object server performs object assembly and disassembly, caching and synchronization, and service invocation functions;(Column 11, lines 60-67 – column 12 lines 1-11)

The claimed feature of “ automatically makes the computing applications aware of the business events” merely automates procedures that have been well established in the area of business software, it is the examiners position that that automation of a process does not establish novelty (*In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192,194)

Claims 11, 21 and 31 are in parallel with claim 1 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 2,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
a rules engine within the enterprise integration layer to define and store rules regarding
validation and data integrity, data and service access, event notification, and caching. (Figure 6)

Claim 23 is in parallel with claim 2 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 3,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
a business event repository within the enterprise integration layer to contain definitions of
business events (Figure 6).

Claim 13 is in parallel with claim 3 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 4,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
a back-office metadata repository within the enterprise integration layer to hold metadata
supplied by the adapters.(Column 13, lines 39-67)
14 24

Claims 14 and 24 are in parallel with claim 4 and are rejected for at least the same
reasons.

As per claim 5,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
a transaction processor within the enterprise integration layer to provide distributed
transactional quality of service. (Column 19, lines 9-46)

Claims 15 and 25 are in parallel with claim 5 and are rejected for at least the same
reasons.

As per claim 6,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
a local data store within the enterprise integration layer to make data persistent within the
enterprise integration layer.(Column 13, lines 39-67)

Claims 16 and 26 are in parallel with claim 6 and are rejected for at least the same
reasons.

As per claim 7,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising
wherein the client access interfaces comprise: an object interface; a relational interface;

Art Unit: 3621

and a web services interface. (Figure 6)

Claims 17 and 27 are in parallel with claim 7 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 8,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 1
wherein the enterprise integration layer uses previously existing infrastructure services within the enterprise. (Column 19, lines 9-46)

Claims 18 and 28 are in parallel with claim 8 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 9,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 8
wherein the previously existing infrastructure services are selected from a group of services comprising: a naming and directory service; a security service; and an application management and monitoring system. (Column 19, lines 9-46)

Claims 19 and 29 are in parallel with claim 9 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 10,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 9
wherein the previously existing infrastructure services include each of a group of services comprising: a naming and directory service; a security service; and an application management and monitoring system. (Column 19, lines 9-46)

Claims 20 and 30 are in parallel with claim 10 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 12,
Suarez ('789) discloses the system of claim 11 further comprising
an enterprise object model within the enterprise integration layer to standardize business objects.(Figure 1)

Claim 22 is in parallel with claim 12 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 33,
Suarez ('789) discloses the method of claim 31
wherein the business event and the data related to the business event are combined in a single packet.(Figure 7A)

As per claim 33,

Art Unit: 3621

Suarez ('789) discloses the method of claim 31 wherein the business event and the data related to the business event are published to a message bus. (Column 11, lines 15-42)

As per claim 34,
Suarez ('789) discloses the method of claim 31 wherein the business event and the data related to the business event are published to a message queue. (Column 12, lines 54-64)

As per claim 35,
Suarez ('789) discloses the method of claim 31 wherein the business event and the data related to the business event are made available to the enterprise through a messaging system. (Figure 6)

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached at (571) 272-6712. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

Application/Control Number: 10/619,296

Page 6

Art Unit: 3621

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50
Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW

June 11, 2006

KAMBIZ ABDI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kambiz Abdi
AU 3621